

Application No. 10/791,965  
Amendment Dated March 27, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of January 26, 2006

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

#### Introductory Comments

Claims 1-57 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1-6, 23, 24, 27-32, 34, 41, 44, and 47-53 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,556,201) and further in view of Hirano (U.S. Patent No. 6,885,408).

Claims 25 and 26 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al. and further in view of Ange (U.S. Patent No. 6,121,963).

Claims 54-57 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al. and further in view of Gulick, Jr., et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,373,637).

Claims 7, 15, and 36 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al. and further in view of Hirano as applied to claims 1-6, 23, 24, 27-32, 34, 41, 44, and 47-53 above, and further in view of Smilansky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,323,856).

Claims 8 and 45 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al. and further in view of Hirano as applied to claims 1-6, 23, 24, 27-32, 34, 41, 44, and 47-53 above, and further in view of Robotham et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,084,590).

Claims 9 and 42 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al. and further in view of Hirano as applied to claims 1-6, 23, 24, 27-32, 34, 41, 44, and 47-53 above, and further in view of Motoshima et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,271,806).

Claims 10, 11, and 14 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al. and further in view of Hirano as applied to claims 1-6, 23, 24, 27-32, 34, 41, 44, and 47-53 above, and further in view of Haeberli (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0065590).

Claims 16 and 33 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al. and further in view of Hirano as applied to claims 1-6, 23, 24,

Application No. 10/791,965  
Amendment Dated March 27, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of January 26, 2006

27-32, 34, 41, 44, and 47-53 above, and further in view of Moe (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0029829).

Claims 17, 20, and 35 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al. and further in view of Hirano as applied to claims 1-6, 23, 24, 27-32, 34, 41, 44, and 47-53 above, and further in view of Rosenholtz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,883,138).

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al. and further in view of Hirano and further in view of Haeberli as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Robotham et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,323,856).

Claims 18, 19, and 43 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al. and further in view of Hirano and further in view of Smilansky et al. as applied to claims 17, 20 and 35 above, and further in view of Rosenholtz et al.

Claims 21, 22, 37-39, and 40 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al. and further in view of Hirano and further in view of Rosenholtz et al. as applied to claims 17, 20 and 35 above, and further in view of Echerer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,740,267).

Claim 46 is rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maehara et al. and further in view of Hirano, and further in view of Robotham et al. ('856) as applied to claims 8 and 45 above, and further in view of Motoshima et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,740,237).

Of these claims, 1, 23, 41-44, 47, 50-52, 54 and 56 are independent claims. For brevity, and because the Applicants' arguments in traversal of the rejection of the independent claims are equally applicable for the relative dependent claims, the Applicants will address only the independent claims in this response. However, traversal is made with the understanding that the remaining dependent claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and may include additional features that, beyond those recited in the independent claims, provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

Claims 1-57 were pending. Claims 1, 23, 27, 41-44, 47, 50-52 and 54 have been amended to further clarify the claimed invention. Claims 17, 18 and 55 have been withdrawn. Claims 3 and 14 have been amended to correct typographical errors. Claim has been added.

Application No. 10/791,965  
Amendment Dated March 27, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of January 26, 2006

In response to the Office action mailed January 26, 2006, the Examiner's claim rejections have been considered. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections regarding all pending claims, as amended, and earnestly solicit allowance of these claims.

Response To Rejections Of Independent Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Independent claims 1, 23, 41, 44, 47 and 50-52 stand rejected as unpatentable over Maehara et al. and further in view of Hirano. Claims 1, 23, 41, 44, 47 and 50-52 have been amended to include, in substance, software or method steps for enabling at least one interactive function that provides a transparent layer and for movement of the transparent layer from a first position on a display to a second position on the display, and causes a currently viewable image to move to the second position on the display. Newly added claim 58 also contains this element. Support for this amendment and new claim can be found at least in withdrawn claims 17 and 18, and therefore, the amendment does not add new matter. This element is not taught or suggested by either Maehara et al. or Hirano. Further, this element is not taught or suggested by any other cited reference. Thus, the Applicants contend that independent claims 1, 23, 41, 44, 47 and 50-52 are allowable.

Independent claims 54 and 55 stand rejected as unpatentable over Maehara et al. in view of Gulick, Jr. et al. Claim 54 has been amended so that it now recites a lenticular sheet on which a plurality of images of an object have been deposited on a plurality of lenticular lenses, whereby a user is provided with the illusion of movement when pressure is applied to different portions of the lenticular sheet. Withdrawn claim 55 contains this element, and therefore new matter has not been added by the amendment to claim 54. Maehara et al. and Gulick, Jr. et al. fail to teach or suggest this element, either individually or in combination. Further, this element is not taught or suggested by any other cited reference. Thus, the Applicants contend that independent claim 54 is allowable.

Independent claim 56 is rejected by the Office action over Maehara et al. in view of Gulick, Jr. et al. Claim 56 recites a means for retaining a lenticular layer that provides a gap between the lenticular layer and a support surface layer. This gap has the advantage of permitting relative movement between the lenticular layer and the support surface when pressure is applied to the lenticular assembly. Maehara et al. and Gulick, Jr. et al. fail to teach or suggest

Application No. 10/791,965  
Amendment Dated March 27, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of January 26, 2006

this element, either individually or in combination. Further, this element is not taught or suggested by any other cited reference. Thus, the Applicants contend that independent claim 56 is allowable.

Response To Rejections Of Dependent Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The pending claims that depend from independent claims 1, 23, 41-44, 47, 50-52, 54 and 56, which are dependent claims 2-16, 19-22, 24-40, 45-46, 48-49, 53 and 57, are each allowable for the same reasons stated above with respect to the respective independent claims. However, each of the dependent claims may include additional features that, beyond those recited in the independent claims, provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability. Applicants reserve the right to assert such independent bases for patentability should it become necessary.

Application No. 10/791,965  
Amendment Dated March 27, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of January 26, 2006

### CONCLUSION


Applicants have made an earnest and bona fide effort to clarify the issues before the Examiner and to place this case in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all of pending claims 1-16 and 19-54 and 56-58 is believed to be in order, and an early Notice of Allowance to this effect is respectfully requested.

No fee is believed due with the submission of this paper. However, if the Applicant is mistaken, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees from Deposit Account No. 502811.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the foregoing, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (310) 712-8311. The undersigned attorney can normally be reached Monday through Friday from about 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM Pacific Time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 27, 2006



Ivan M. Posey  
Reg. No. 43,865  
Customer Number 30076  
Brown Raysman Millstein Felder & Steiner LLP  
1880 Century Park East, Suite 1200  
Los Angeles, California 90067-1621